Vigiliae Christianae 44 (1990), 25-53, E. J. Brill, Leiden

SPIRIT AND PROPHECY IN THE EPISTULA IACOBI APOCRYPHA (NHC I,2)

BY

J. VAN DER VLIET

Et ma tête surgie
Solitaire vigie
Dans les vols triomphaux
De cette faux

Comme rupture franche
Plutôt refoule ou tranche
Les anciens désaccords
Avec le corps
S. Mallarmé, *Cantique de Saint Jean*

The Coptic Letter of James from Nag Hammadi (hereafter: *EpJac*) makes puzzling reading. Not the least among its oddities is that it demands its readers to become filled with the Spirit while at the same time denying them the possibility to prophesy. As J. Reiling, in his book on Hermas and Christian prophecy, points out: "this use of the concept of being filled deserves a treatment of its own".[1] The present study seeks to fill this need. It will be concerned mainly with *EpJac*'s attitude towards Christian prophecy. First, however, something must be said about the context in which the unknown author presents his ideas on prophecy and about his concept of the spiritual underlying them.[2]

EpJac 2-7: unity and coherence

Although *EpJac* claims to be a letter to an unknown addressee,[3] its form is essentially that of a dialogue between the risen Christ and two of his disciples: James, the pretended author of the letter, and Peter.[4] Their conversation takes place immediately before Christ's ascension which is situated here on the 550th day after his resurrection. On this day Christ appears to the Twelve who are writing their memoirs.[5] He announces his return to heaven. The disciples are invited to follow him. Jesus points out, however, that whether or not they will enter the

Kingdom of Heavens does not depend on an order from his part, but on their own inner preparation alone: if they enter the Kingdom, it will be on account of their being *full* (2: 30-33). Then Christ takes James and Peter apart "in order to fill them" (2:35). A long speech of Christ follows, interrupted from time to time by questions or remarks of James and Peter. As will be seen, these serve as a literary device, introducing a new theme or giving rise to further development of a theme touched upon by Christ in passing.[6]

The beginning of Christ's speech (p. 2-7), which will occupy us here, divides into three sections. Although this may not be apparent at first sight, these sections are firmly connected, both formally and by their contents, and develop logically from the starting-point defined on p. 2: 'how to attain the Kingdom of Heavens'.[7] This is the *Leitmotiv* of the entire dialogue, which appropriately ends with the ascension of Christ and a frustrated effort from the part of James and Peter to follow him (p. 15).

The first of the three initial sections (2:40-4:22) is an exhortation to spiritual perfection in rather abstract and stereotyped terms, employing pairs of oppositions.[8] The same pairs are often but not exclusively found in Valentinian gnosticism.[9] James and Peter—and in them the readers—are exhorted to be sober instead of drunk (3:9-10),[10] to be awake instead of sleeping (3:11-12).[11] Health and rest are contrasted with illness (3:25ff);[12] fullness with deficiency, emptiness and diminution.[13] In a complicated dialectic discourse on fulfillment and diminution, these exhortations are brought to a climax (4:3-22).[14] This last passage contains two statements which determine the character of the next two sections and lead up to them: first, it is said that real fullness is a stage preceding *perfection* (4:13; *jôk abal*); second, being filled is specified as being filled with the *Spirit* (4:19), as opposed to 'the word' (*logos*) which is said to be psychical.[15] Here the first section ends.

The next two sections are introduced each by a question of James. They are remarkable for presenting clear and outspoken views on two issues hotly debated in 2nd and 3rd century Christianity: martyrdom and prophecy. The transition to the theme of martyrdom may seem abrupt at first sight but is easily explained by the preceding statement on fullness leading up to perfection (4:13). In the 2nd century the perfection-terminology, expressed in Greek τελειόω, Coptic *jôk ebol* and their cognates, had become associated in a technical sense with martyrdom.[16] In the Alexandria of Clement martyrdom was τελείωσις *tout*

court.[17] Thus it is understandable how in *EpJac* mentioning perfection may provoke a frightened reaction from James (4:22-31). James, too, introduces the section on prophecy (6:21-28) in response to another keyword in Jesus' speech: 'to be filled with the Spirit'—a *terminus technicus* as well.[18] In both cases the same literary device is used: a keyword from the preceding speech by Jesus is taken up by James to put the *wrong* question:[19]

— in 4:22-31: we want to follow you, but allow us not to be tempted by the devil;

— in 6:21-28: teach us how we can prophesy.

In both cases Christ's reaction is negative: following him implies suffering and martyrdom; prophecy is dead.

The link, however, between the section on martyrdom and that on prophecy is not only formal but also substantial. Both deal with the practical realization of the spiritual perfection which in the first section is demanded in abstract terms.[20] Being filled with the Spirit leads up to perfection which is realized in the martyr's death, but does not involve prophetic speech. The mention of the Holy Spirit in the end of the section on martyrdom (6:20-21) serves as a *rappel de thème*, occasioning James' question on the ability to prophesy. Both sections are balanced around *EpJac*'s concept of spiritual fulfillment and perfection, of which they are a logical and indispensable elaboration. This will be confirmed by a review of *EpJac*'s concept of the spiritual.

The Spirit in EpJac

The Spirit (*pn(eum)a*) occurs seven times in *EpJac*, of which three are in the sections discussed above. It should be emphasized that these occurrences together do not constitute a full pneumatology. Thus, our picture of *EpJac*'s ideas on the spiritual will merely be an outline.

The fullest anthropological statement of *EpJac* is contained in 11:35ff.[21] It displays the familiar trichotomy *soma/sarx-psyche-pneuma* and defines the relationship between these three, as well as their share in salvation, in an entirely classic way. The soul (*psyche*) can be brought to life, or raised,[22] by the Spirit (*pneuma*), but it may as well be killed by the body (*soma*). In this last case, *EpJac* explains, the soul actually kills itself by means of sin (12:8ff). The flesh (*sarx*) provides the occasion (*aitia*; 12:11), but does not sin itself without the complicity of the soul (11:38-39).[23] If, on the other hand, the soul is saved and without

evil and if the Spirit is saved as well, then the body becomes free of sin (12:2-5). So, if the soul chooses to be saved, which is possible only by turning to the Spirit (11:39-12:2), even the body may become without sin (12:4-5).[24] If, on the other hand, it chooses to attach itself to the flesh there is no hope at all for salvation (12:12-13).[25]

In other words, salvation is brought about by the Spirit but whether man is saved depends upon his decision to embrace the Spirit and turn away from the flesh. If one takes *EpJac* to be a product of Valentinian gnosticism and accepts the traditional view of Valentinianism according to which the tripartite anthropological scheme is thought to involve a deterministically interpreted theory of 'salvation by nature', *EpJac*'s point of view may seem surprising. Thus, the *ed.pr.* considers the apparent rejection of determinism in the present passage a sign of its originality (p. 67). At best, however, *EpJac*'s position betrays its adherence to established Alexandrian ways of interpreting the letters of St. Paul.[26] The same holds for the apparent tension in *EpJac* between human *proairesis* and divine *pronoia*, between the individual's decision and his pre-existential election.[27]

Evidently, *EpJac* takes a point of view which incorporates both options: divine *pronoia* does not abolish the necessity of a choice of one's own accord (cf. 5:4-6). In spite of the reality of election (particularly clear in 10:34ff and 14:41ff) there appears to be no class of men who during their lifetime can be sure of their election (6:12-14). On the contrary, the readers of *EpJac* have to be urged incessantly towards spiritual perfection in order to be saved. This conditionality of salvation is stressed throughout *EpJac* and explains the persistent and unsettling oscillation in Christ's speech between promise and rejection (cf. 13:26-36 and 14:10-13).

In a second passage, 9:24ff, the disciples are harshly censured as "pretenders to the truth (*mêe*)", "falsifiers of knowledge (*gnosis*)" and "offenders (*parabatês*) of the Spirit". In the following lines their offence is specified as persisting in hearing, while they should be speaking, and in sleeping, while they should be awake in order to be received into the Kingdom of Heavens (9:29-35). Apart from putting on a par Spirit, truth and knowledge, this passage once again resorts to the themes and literary devices found in the first section of Christ's speech (2:40-4:22). Here once more attaining the Kingdom of Heavens is made dependent on the disciples' attitude towards the Spirit and again the exhortations take the form of contrasting the present, deficient condition of the

disciples (sleeping, hearing) to its demanded opposite (being awake, speaking). Falsifying knowledge and offending the Spirit in this section may be contrasted to being filled with the Spirit in the earlier one (4:18-19).

New in this context is the opposition hearing (negative)—speaking (positive). One might be tempted to interpret *šeje*, 'speaking', as referring to 'inspired speech'.[28] A serious objection to this view, however, is Christ's vigorous rejection of the possibility of prophecy expressed shortly before (6:21-7:1). If previously he refused the interpretation of 'being filled with the Spirit' as the ability to prophesy, how then can the interpretation 'inspired speech' be allowed here? It is, moreover, remarkable that where a reference to inspired speech could really be expected, the elusive term *hupothesis* is used (8:36).[29] Still 'speaking' might be seen as referring to the disciples' future teaching activity, especially as *šeje* is used of the teaching of Christ in 8:38,[30] if the context would not suggest a different interpretation.

As has been stated before, the oppositions hearing vs. speaking and sleeping vs. being awake belong in the same category of rhetorical oppositions found already in the first section of Christ's speech and quoted above: being drunk vs. being sober, illness vs. health, etc. They contrast in metaphorical terms the present state of deficiency of the disciples to the state of fullness which they should have already reached much earlier.[31] Being essentially metaphorical, these terms do not denote any physical drunkenness or illness, but a state of mind. In this same metaphorical fashion the present passage in *EpJac* continues: in 10:1ff purity and impurity, light and darkness are opposed, etc. One might connect hearing in this context with νήπιος, the well known counterpart of τέλειος, taken to mean 'childlike, inarticulate, still unable to speak for oneself'.[32] Other passages in *EpJac*, however, are more explicit on the negative connotations of hearing, e.g. 12:39-40: "woe to those who heard (*sôtm*), but did not believe (*rpisteue*)"—to be contrasted to: "blessed will be those who have known (*souôn* =) me" (12:37-39). Actually, this saying is one of a series of more or less disguised variations on John 20:29 which occur throughout *EpJac* and thus constitute another of its major themes.[33] They serve the author to contrast 'hearing', 'seeing' and the like, i.e. perception by the senses, with 'belief' and 'knowledge'.[34] His strong depreciation of perception by the senses even brings him to stretch the argument of John 20:29 to the effect that those who saw and heard Jesus are rated lower than those

who did not (3:17ff). As a consequence, the author of *EpJac* deems the Apostles, c.q. James, inferior in belief (*pistis*) to the believers coming after them.[35] The radicalism of this point of view may seem astonishing, but it was shared by the likewise Egyptian *Epistula Apostolorum*[36] and discussed and criticized by Origen.[37]

Thus, in our passage 'hearing' refers without a shade of doubt to the disciples' imperfect, external perception of Christ, which did not yet develop into belief and knowledge.[38] Taken in this way, it is fully equivalent to drunkenness and sleep in reference to lack of belief, knowledge and Spirit.[39] Speaking, on the other hand, refers like being sober, awake, etc., to the state of consciousness in which dependence on outer perception has been overcome and replaced by inner fullness, without necessarily involving any physical act of speech. This is confirmed by 11:14ff, where 'speaking out freely' (*rparhêsiaze*) is connected with obtaining grace (*hmat*) and contrasted with wanting an advocate (*paraklêtos*) and being in need of grace (11:11-14). This 'speaking' reflects the believer's inner zeal (cf. 7:12-13: *ourat*). As long as he stands in need of outward help (an order: 2:30ff; entreating: 7:11-12; an advocate: 11:11-13) he remains deficient.[40] As will be seen, these distinctions are of some importance for understanding *EpJac*'s view of prophecy.

The aspects of the Spirit discussed up to now are found once more in the section on martyrdom.[41] Being saved implies a choice for the Spirit and against the flesh. The section on martyrdom advocates in vigorous terms the necessity of suffering and death, precisely because accepting these is the exemplary expression of such a choice.[42] The disciples should stop to love (5:6-8) and spare the flesh (*sarx*) and put their trust in the Spirit who protects them (5:21-23): the Spirit, Christ says, "is a wall surrounding them", *-oei nsabt efkôte arau.*

The idea of protection by the Spirit, immediately following a vivid description of the suffering which awaits the disciples, inevitably evokes the widespread early-Christian notion of a special relationship between the Holy Spirit and the martyr.[43] In the zeal for martyrdom one 'makes room (τόπος)' for the Spirit.[44] Thus, the martyr becomes a 'receptacle of the Holy Spirit.[45] The image of the wall is a cliché for which both classical Greek[46] and Old Testament antecedents[47] may be claimed. Anyhow, it clearly expresses effective protection.[48] The nearest parallel of *EpJac*'s phrase in a martyrological context is to be found in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*: the fire "in the form of a vault or a sail filled by the

wind (πνεῦμα)'' encircled the body of the martyr Polycarp without burning him (15,2)—in the Coptic version: *afersobt epsôma npimarturos efkôti*.[49] In no way, of course, does *EpJac* refer to miracles of this kind. In *Mart. Polycarpi*, however, the miracle only visually illustrates the martyr's participation in the 'incorruptibility (ἀφθαρσία) of the Spirit' (14,2).[50] Here the real parallel with *EpJac* shows up. That they are encircled by the Spirit should make James and Peter aware that for them not only their (very real) suffering but their entire earthly existence are accidental (5:23-29). The 'good things' are not of this world (*kosmos*) (5:29-30). A partial parallel is to be found in another passage (9:18-23) where it is said that full understanding of Christ's message, of the *gnosis*, will make them aware that they have no persecutors or oppressors other than themselves.[51]

The text of *EpJac* continues on the theme of salvation through Christ's and the believer's death (5:31-6:21). To the opposition Spirit vs. flesh corresponds an opposition life-gained-through-death vs. life-in-this-world.[52] Through suffering and death the disciples will gain the love of the Father (5:1-5), life (5:31-35), salvation (6:3-4; 15-17), the Kingdom (6:5 ff; 17-18) and equality to Christ (5:2-3). This is summed up in the short peroration which concludes the section on martyrdom: ''verily, I say unto you, none of those who fear death will be saved! For the Kingdom of (God?)[53] belongs to those who have been killed.[54] Surpass me![55] Make yourselves like to the Son of the Holy Spirit'' (6:14-21). The Son of the Holy Spirit can be no other than Christ himself, as is clearly shown by an earlier passage: ''...if you are oppressed by Satan and persecuted and you do his (viz. the Father's) will, I say, he will love you and make you equal to me...'' (4:37-5:3). The same idea is probably to be recognized in the problematic phrase: ''blessed is he who saw himself being the fourth one in heavens!'' (12:15-17).[56]

The *ed.pr.*, p 55, tentatively connected the designation of Christ as the Son of the Holy Spirit to judaeo-christian ideas. The filiation Holy Spirit—Christ, however, got its full momentum in the discussion on the nature of Christ, especially within Valentinian gnosticism.[57] That the term in *EpJac* has its background rather in this issue becomes clear if we contrast it with the appellation 'the Son of Man' (or even simply: 'the Man') in the first section of *EpJac* (3:12 ff). J. Zandee has pointed out that 'the Son of Man' here refers to the human (as opposed to the divine) nature of Christ, aptly quoting *Epistula ad Rheginum* (NHC I,4) 44:21-33.[58] The rationale for *EpJac*'s use of the term 'Son of Man',

resp. 'Son of the Holy Spirit', is provided by the context. *EpJac* 3:12 ff. deals with seeing Christ, talking with him and consorting with him—in short, with knowing Christ through the senses. As could be noted before, this is to the author of *EpJac* not something positive. In the context of perception by the senses, which is opposed by *EpJac* to belief (*pistis*) and knowledge (*gnosis*), the terms 'Son of Man' and 'Man' apparently serve to denote the visible and human aspect of Christ.[59] When, on the other hand, Christ calls himself the Son of the Holy Spirit the context is completely different. Martyrdom is for *EpJac* imitation of Christ. It involves turning from the flesh and from this world towards the Spirit, the outcome of which will be, in one word, salvation. If in death the martyr will become equal to Christ, this must be to Christ in his spiritual aspect or, in other words, to him who was raised from among the dead by the Spirit of God (Rom. 8:11).[60]

Finally, two other places illustrate in a vivid way the role of the Spirit as a means of ascending towards the divine. In 14: 33-34, at the moment of his ascension, Christ says that he is "carried upwards by a spiritual chariot (*ouharma mpn(eum)a*)". Already the *ed.pr.* pointed out the similarity of this image to the originally Platonic idea of the Spirit as a wing which carries the soul upwards to heaven. This image is e.g. found in Basilides and Clement of Alexandria.[61]

A few lines later in *EpJac* the Spirit is the (potential) medium for getting into contact with the majesty of God (15: 6-29).[62] After Christ's ascension James and Peter try to follow him into heaven (15:8 ff). First, they send their heart (*hêt*) up "towards the heavens"; then, higher still, their intelligence (*nous*) and, finally, they intend to send their Spirit "upwards to the Greatness" (15:23-26).[63] But having ascended, they are not allowed to see or hear anything owing to the all too human curiosity of the other disciples who call them back to earth (15:26-34).

The series 'heart—intelligence—Spirit', although reminiscent of the trichotomy 'flesh/body—soul—Spirit' found earlier in *EpJac*, can nevertheless not be directly identified with it.[64] Instead of with an anthropological triad, we are dealing with an epistemological one: a threefold hierarchy of faculties of perception and understanding, connected here with a three-step ascension towards the divine, represented in its turn by the image of three heavenly spheres.

This combination of features connects the scene with the originally cosmological and eschatological *Himmelsreise*.[65] *EpJac*'s interest, however, is not primarily in celestial geography, nor in angelology. The

Himmelsreise-imagery mainly serves as an illustration of the three-stage model of progress in understanding and knowledge which was commonplace in the Alexandrian tradition.[66] In *EpJac* the first sphere of heaven is characterized by the sounds of wars, the second by the hymns of the angels. The third sphere is associated with the Spirit and with divine majesty ('the Greatness') as instrument and object of vision respectively). It is there, apparently, that the aim of spiritual perfection is reached. The first two stages of the disciples' ascension, associated with the heart and the intelligence (*nous*), are still indebted to the outer modes of perception held in such low esteem in *EpJac*: "we saw with our eyes and heared with our ears" (15:9-11 and 16-18). Accordingly, in the third sphere of heaven is to be found "what no eye saw and no ear heared and did not enter the heart of a man" (1 Cor. 2: 9).[67] Thus, the three heavens of *EpJac* may be identified with, respectively, the sensible world (heart, turmoil), the intelligible world (*nous*; angelic singing of praise) and the spiritual realm of pure vision (Spirit; the Greatness).

Besides corresponding to a three-phase model of progress in perception, the number of three heavens, instead of the more common one of seven or more, is strongly reminiscent of St. Paul's vision in 2 Cor. 12:2-4.[68] There is, however, one decisive difference between both visions: whereas St. Paul, in the third heaven, heard ἄρρητα ῥήματα, James and Peter do not hear anything save the voices of the other disciples. Compared to both the preceding ascension of Christ and Paul's vision, their attempt is an outright failure. The explanation of this may be provided by St. Paul who repeatedly wonders whether he was transported to heaven bodily or outside the body. For Peter and James this is no question: they are yet safely tied to the body (ears; eyes) and to this world (represented by the other disciples). With their failed realization of St. Paul's vision may be contrasted the promise Origen holds out to the martyr: those who carry the cross after Jesus and renounce the world will follow Christ up through the heavens and will not come down again, as did St. Paul, but, on the contrary, will see more and more important things and ascend quickly.[69] The theme is a familiar one in *EpJac*: only when like Christ the believer will have gone through death, he will reach perfection.

Thus, the scene of the failed ascension of James and Peter bears only a formal resemblance to mystical or ecstatic visions.[70] Its real purport is like everything in *EpJac* admonitory. While holding out a promise of future vision, it once more reminds the reader of the requirements for

following Christ to heaven: progress towards the spiritual, perfection in the martyr's death. Thus it provides a visual summary of the main themes of the dialogue which it brings to a close.

The Spirit in *EpJac* is the divine element in man which grants him protection, incorruptibility and heavenly life. Diametrically opposed to the action of the Spirit is that of the flesh which connects man with sin, death and the visible world. In order to be saved, the Christian should turn from the flesh towards the Spirit. This constitutes a process of interior development, denoted as 'to be filled with the Spirit', which leads up to perfection. The main agents of this process are, next to love and the works, belief (*pistis*) and knowledge (*gnosis*).[71] They are the fruits of the revelation of the Logos, the mission of Christ, who is himself offspring of the Divine Spirit.[72] Imitating Christ in the martyr's fate is the best expression of the desire for perfection as it is the most radical way of turning away from the lower nature.

Essential in the believer's spiritual progress is his development in perception. From dependent on sense-perception he should come to rely on belief and knowledge as granted by Christ. To the traditional tripartite anthropological hierarchy 'flesh/body—soul—Spirit' corresponds one of epistemological faculties: 'heart—intelligence—Spirit'. Also the stage of purely intellectual understanding, that of the lower *logos* which is called 'psychical' (4:21-22), should be transcended. Having reached the stage of perfection, the Christian, being spiritualized, will be carried up to God by the Spirit and granted vision of his majesty.

It is this concept of being filled with the Spirit which the author of *EpJac* has to defend against the current use of the term to denote a momentary influx of prophetic charisma resulting in prophetic speech.[73]

The rejection of prophecy: terminology

Christ's mention of the Holy Spirit concludes his speech on martyrdom and, at the same time, provides the starting-point for a new development of the original theme: to become full of the Spirit. This is introduced by a question of James:

> "Lord, how shall we be able to prophesy to those who request us to prophesy to them? For there are many who ask us and look to us to hear a word (*logos*) from us" (6:22-28).

Christ answers:

> "Do you not know that the head of prophecy was hewn off with John?" (6:29-31)—

to which, asked for explanation, he adds:

> "When you know what means 'head', and that prophecy proceeds from the head, then grasp the meaning of 'its head was cut off'!" (6:35-7:1).

The general tendency of Jesus' answer is quite clear: no more prophecy is possible, as it came to an end with the death of John the Baptist. The terms, however, in which his statement is couched demand closer scrutiny. In a condensed form these appear to combine a number of distinct meaningful elements:

1°. a biased exegesis of Mt. 11:13/Lc. 16:16 ("all the prophets and the law prophesied till John");
2°. a metaphorical interpretation of the circumstances of the death of John the Baptist (Mt. 14:10/Mc. 6:27/Lc. 9:9) which is viewed as the decapitation of prophecy itself. This implies
3°. an interpretation of prophecy in physiological terms. From the fact that prophecy has a head which can be cut off, we may logically infer that it has a body as well;
4°. to the head, evidently in contrast to the body, a distinctive feature is ascribed, viz. that of being the source of prophetic speech.

Already the *ed. pr.* noted some parallels for *EpJac*'s statement.[74] Neither these parallels, however, nor the *EpJac* passage itself have up to now been the object of a full assessment. Any real parallel, moreover, should account for all of the elements found present in *EpJac*'s concise statement. The methaphorical use of the head-body opposition and, in a general sense, of physiological imagery is found throughout the whole of Antiquity in widely varying contexts.[75] It is in itself not very specific.[76] The idea of the head as the source of inspired speech is equally widespread and unspecific.[77] More interesting are those texts which, like *EpJac*, apply the physiological metaphor to prophecy. Rather predictably, Christian examples will prove to be indebted to St. Paul, esp. to 1 Cor. 12.

Direct indebtness to St. Paul is particularly evident in another Nag Hammadi treatise, the *Interpretation of Knowledge* (NHC XI, 1).[78] This text, combating strife and jealousy within the Church concerning the distribution of charismatic gifts, extensively employs the Pauline imagery of the members of the body which all share in the gifts proceeding from the head, i.e. Christ.[79] *Interpretation of Knowledge*, however,

following St. Paul, takes a view of contemporary prophecy which is diametrically opposed to that of *EpJac*. Its attitude is cheerful and encouraging: "Does someone have a prophetic gift? Share it without hesitation!" (15:35-37).

Another document of Egyptian provenance is Pap. Oxyrhynchus I,5.[80] This fragmentary papyrus, dating from the end of the 3rd or beginning of the 4th century,[81] quotes Hermas, *Mand.* XI, 9-10.a and subsequently comments on these lines. Hermas' text deals with the manifestation of the gift of prophecy within the assembled church:

> "Now, when the man who has the Divine Spirit (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἔχων τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον) comes into a meeting of righteous men who have the faith of the Divine Spirit, and an appeal is made to God by the assembly of those men, then the Angel of the prophetic Spirit, laying on him, fills the man, and this man, filled with the Holy Spirit (πλησθείς ... τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ), speaks to the congregation according to the will of the Lord. Thus the Spirit of the Godhead (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θειότητος) will be manifest".[82]

Pap. Oxy. I,5 continues:

> "For the prophetic Spirit is the body (σωματεῖον, 'corporation') of the prophetic rank (τῆς προφητικῆς τάξεως), that is: the physical body (τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκός) of Jesus Christ, which through Mary became blended with humanity".[83]

Owing to their isolated transmission, the interpretation of these lines is not unproblematic.[84] With J. Reiling, one might understand that the church, being a 'body' of men,[85] is nevertheless, as it is the realization of the body of Christ, in its entirety pneumatic[86] and, potentially, prophetic.[87] Such an interpretation would be more in line with Hermas' text—and with the Pauline formulae—than the alternative, which would stress the priviliged position of a definite class (τάξις) of prophets. The general application of the term προφητικὴ τάξις, which is used by Heracleon to denote the prophets of Israel,[88] to the church as a whole is parallelled in the Valentinian view, echoing St. Paul as well, that "the Spirit which each of the (Old Testament) prophets possessed exclusively for his ministry, is poured out on all belonging to the church. That's why the signs of the Spirit, healings and prophecies, are performed through the church".[89]

Thus, besides *EpJac*, some more sources of Egyptian provenance, and roughly contemporary with it, make use of physiological imagery in their discussion of Christian prophecy. They do this in order to claim

the charismatic gifts for the church in its entirety. Especially Pap. Oxy. I,5 is of interest for its direct assimilation of prophecy with a body, viz. the body of men representing the body of Christ. The same directness is to be found in *EpJac*, save that *EpJac* chooses to assimilate prophecy not with the body of Christ but with that of John the Baptist. Moreover, as is stressed by *Interpretation of Knowledge* (16:28-31; cf. Eph. 4: 7-16), the church as a body must maintain its intimate connection with the head, Christ, who is the source of all grace. In *EpJac* as well the head is the source of prophetic speech, but it is severed from the body. Thus, the physiological imagery in *EpJac* appears to supply the negative of the picture provided by Pap. Oxy. I,5 and *Interpretation of Knowledge*.

Among the parallels which have already been cited by the *ed. pr.* one stands out as being unquestionably closest. This is rather not the passage from the *Acta Archelai* which seems to be the favorite of *EpJac*'s editors,[90] but a longer one from Origen's *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew*. There, in X, 21-22, Origen develops a series of brilliant improvisations on the theme of the death of John the Baptist.[91] At the outset of these stands Origen's interpretation of Mt. 11:13. After John the prophetic grace from among the Jews came to an end.[92] Accordingly, John is taken to symbolize the prophetic word (ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος).[93] In beheading John the Baptist, the Jews deprived themselves of the ability to yield prophets: there ceased to be any prophetic head (κεφαλὴ προφητική) among the people.[94] Nevertheless, Origen says, we have to thank God that, in spite of the disappearance of the prophetic grace from among the people, a grace superior to all grace of the prophets is spread among the nations through Jesus.[95] The Jews don't have the head of prophecy (κεφαλὴ τῆς προφητείας) because they rejected the capital part (κεφάλαιον) of all prophecy: Jesus Christ.[96] Refusing to believe in Christ, they refused to believe the prophets. Thus, after shutting up the prophetic word (τὸν λόγον τὸν προφητικόν) in jail, they cut it down (ἀποτέμνουσιν), and now they have it as a corpse, cut apart (νεκρὸν καὶ διαιρεθέντα) and unhealthy in every respect, because they do not understand it. We, on the other hand, have Jesus unimpaired (ὁλόκληρον).[97]

From the opposition of the dead and disfigured body of prophecy to the wholesome body of Chirst the argument logically leads to Origen's interpretation of the following episode (Mt. 14:12ff.) as the establishment of the church among the nations.[98] This turn of the argument is summarized by Jerome in his commentary on St. Matthew:

> "Postquam a Iudaeis et rege Iudaeorum prophetae truncatum est caput et linguam ac uocem apud eos perdidit prophetia, Iesus transiit ad desertum ecclesiae locum quae uirum antea non habuerat".[99]

Thus the elements which can be discovered in *EpJac*'s condensed dictum, viz. John the Baptist as a terminus, his decapitation as the death of prophecy itself, the 'negative' application of physiological terminology to prophecy and the insistence on the "head of prophecy"—all of these appear to have their natural place within Origen's coherent exegesis of Mt. 14.

For Origen the beheading of John has a double meaning: it signifies the loss of the gift of prophecy among the Jews—a polemic theme which occurs more often in his work[100]—as well as the opposition of the past revelation of the prophets to the new and superior revelation of Christ, which has as its corollary the opposition between the old order of Israel and the new order of the Church.[101] That the idea of opposing old and new was present in the mind of the author of *EpJac* too, is strongly suggested by his physiological terminology, the ecclesiological features of which, inherited from St. Paul, are evident in both Origen's text and the other parallels produced above.[102] Nevertheless, the emphasis is in *EpJac* on the issue of prophecy as such. This appears if one compares the *EpJac* passage with logion 52 from the *Gospel of Thomas*:

> "His disciples said to him: twenty-four prophets spoke in Israel and all of them spoke about you. He said to them: you skipped the living one who is in front of you and started to talk about the dead."[103]

If the prophets are said to be dead here, it is to stress the superiority of the revelation of Christ to all former revelation rather like in Hebr. 1:1 ff.[104] *EpJac*, however, is concerned first of all with the impossibility of contemporary prophecy which was apparently so much in demand with 'many' (6:25-28). It should be noted that in this respect *EpJac* makes one step further than Origen in his *St. Matthew Commentary*. *EpJac* adopts the multilayered interpretation of the beheading of John, found ready at hand either in Origen or elsewhere in the Alexandrian milieu and taken by Origen to signify the end of prophecy *among the Jews*, to demonstrate the end of *all* prophecy. This poses the question how *EpJac*'s outspoken point of view on Christian prophecy relates to contemporary opinion, foremost to that of Origen himself, and how it can be explained.

The rejection of prophecy: the historical setting

While *EpJac* is quite unambiguous in its rejection of contemporary Christian prophecy, Origen's teaching on this subject is far from monolithic. His opinions may vary according to the context.[105] Essentially, for Origen the contemporary successors of the Old Testament prophets are the 'doctores ecclesiae'.[106] In *Contra Celsum* he says that prophecy after the incarnation did not die but was "received up into heaven", which can mean little else than that it disappeared from the earth.[107] After the coming of Christ the Jews remained entirely devoid of the signs of divine presence among them, as they cannot boast anymore prophets and miracles. Instead, however, of ascribing these wholeheartedly to the church, as e.g. the Valentinians in the time of Clement still did, Origen allows the Christian only 'traces' of them: ἴχνη, a term he uses repeatedly in this context.[108] Straightforwardly, but on very weak grounds, he rejects Celsus' claim of having seen prophets comparable to the old ones,[109] and elsewhere, exactly like *EpJac*, he takes Mt. 11:13/Lc. 16:16 to mean that prophets and prophecy ceased to exist.[110] Evidently, he is as little in sympathy with the kind of prophecy in popular demand as is the author of *EpJac*.[111]

An obstacle to this critical approach might have been provided by the reality and widely accepted authority of prophecy within the early Christian communities. Propagators of prophecy could find its full justification in both New Testament and apostolic writings. Origen had to face this problem,[112] while *EpJac*, claiming apostolic authority, could avoid it. Other authors, however, clung to the traditional appreciation. Thus, Irenaeus of Lyon harshly criticizes those who dare deny the reality of prophetic charisma within the church.[113] Among Egyptian sources some have already been quoted above, e.g. the treatise *Interpretation of Knowledge*, like *EpJac* part of the Nag Hammadi find. From the papyri it appears that Hermas, with his full description of prophetic activity within the church communities (*Mand.* XI), belonged to the most popular reading of early Christian Egypt.[114]. Nevertheless, *EpJac* is not alone among early Christian sources in setting a terminus to prophecy: before Origen Clement had already opposed the prophets of Israel (past) to the apostles and teachers of the church (present).[115] The Muratori-fragment denies the *Pastor* of Hermas a place in its canon either among the prophets "whose number is complete" or among the apostles.[116] Also the Sibylline Oracles simply state as an accepted fact

that prophecy ceased after Christ.[117] And in rabbinic Judaism opinions remarkably close to those of Origen can be heard.[118] The decline of prophecy which these attitudes betray, although naturally connected with developments within the church as an organisation,[119] was without doubt speeded up considerably by the prophetic excesses which characterized the 2nd century, both Christian[120] and pagan.[121] Of these, Montanism probably did most to deliver prophecy within the church its *coup de grâce*.[122]

Both Clement and Origen, among many others, took a position against Montanism and doing this may have influenced their ideas on Christian prophecy.[123] Quite probably *EpJac*'s strongly expressed rejection of contemporary prophecy, too, has polemical aims: prophecy, no less than martyrdom, was after all an issue in 2nd and 3rd century Christianity. There are two arguments which might favour the thesis that the author of *EpJac* did not just have the popular demand for signs and prophecies in mind, but perhaps the more specific phenomenon of Montanism as well. The first of these is that, as it appears, Mt. 11:13/Lc. 16:16 was widely used against Montanism.[124] The second, and perhaps more convincing, argument derives from the close association in *EpJac* of prophecy and martyrdom. Although its author does not deny the special relationship which connects the martyr with the Holy Spirit, rather on the contrary as has been shown above, he does deny that this relationship implies inspired speech, as was generally derived from Mt. 10:19-20 and parallels.[125] As is well known, Montanism warmly advocated both martyrdom and prophecy and boasted both prophets and martyrs. P. Nautin attempted to demonstrate that the *Letter of the Martyrs of Lyon* was composed in view of developing Montanism in order to show how within orthodoxy martyrdom and the gifts of the Spirit ideally combine.[126] Thus, one might suppose that *EpJac*, reflecting a later stage of anti-Montanist polemics, decided to emphatically dissociate martyrdom from prophecy, which had not only become obsolete by changes within the church but had, moreover, become discredited by heresy. It should, nevertheless, be remembered that the coupling of prophet and martyr was in no way limited to Montanism and that the charismatic authority of the martyr continued to be a reality within the church in spite of Montanism.[127]

Even so, the prophetic frenzy of the 2nd century and especially the very real crisis of Montanism may have created the historical background for *EpJac*'s radical rejection of post-John the Baptist pro-

phecy. Still, these circumstances do not sufficiently explain *EpJac*'s position. What view did its author take of prophecy in scorning what for St. Paul was a highly commendable spiritual gift (1 Cor. 14:1)? To answer this question it is necessary to turn to John the Baptist again.

The rejection of prophecy: motives

The image of John's beheading, taken in all probability from Origen, has, as shown above, a double aspect: it signifies the end of prophecy as well as the transition from the old order of Israel to the new order of the church. John, in a way, symbolizes this historical rupture and his mediating position may conceivably be reflected in the judgement of his revelation. Thus, in his *St. Matthew Commentary* Origen reminds his readers that John, who embodies the προφητικὸς λόγος, is a prophet and more than a prophet (Mt. 11:9/Lc. 7:26). But he continues to contrast "the entire prophetic grace" with the superior grace communicated to the world by Jesus.[128] The prophets, up to and including John, only gave indirectly, incompletely and locally, what Christ gives directly, fully and universally.[129] This valuation of John's prophetic gift, based on Mt. 11:9/Lc. 7:26, is strongly reminiscent of another discussion of the status of the Baptist vis-à-vis Christ on the one hand and the Old Testament prophets on the other, viz. the one by Heracleon from his commentary on the gospel of St. John.[130]

Heracleon, in the fragments transmitted and discussed by Origen in his own commentary on the fourth gospel, does not only deal with the historical position of John as a mediator between the order of Old Testament prophets (the προφητικὴ τάξις)[131] and Christ, but also with the nature of his revelation. His view of John the Baptist has been the object of a fine study by J. Mouson.[132] There he shows how Heracleon defines the position of John the Baptist and of Old Testament prophecy on exactly the kind of three-level scale of progressive perception as found in *EpJac*: the lowest level is represented by the προφητικὴ τάξις, called ἦχος, 'noise', which in John was transformed into 'voice', φωνή. But John was unable to proceed to the highest, pneumatic level of perception which implies the transformation from 'voice' into 'word', Logos.[133] In spite of being "more than a prophet", John still represents an imperfect, 'psychical' level of belief and knowledge—in the terms of Heracleon: he is still female, not yet male, servant, not yet disciple. The 'psychical' level on which the prophecy of John has its place is the one

characterized by dependence on perception through the senses: δι' αἰσθήσεως πείθεσθαι.[134] Heracleon's appraisal of this level of belief may be summarized in Christ's complaint in John 4:48: "if you do not see signs and wonders, you will not believe".[135]

Apparently, Heracleon's definition of the status of John the Baptist makes use of the same distinctions underlying *EpJac*'s concept of spiritual progress. The interpretation of John the Baptist and older prophecy in terms of these distinctions may explain why *EpJac* chooses an otherwise perhaps far-fetched exegesis of Mt. 11:13/Lc. 16:16 to formulate its opinion on contemporary prophecy. *EpJac*'s verdict on prophecy primarily concerns its inability to contribute to the believer's growth towards spiritual perfection.[136] Prophecy is obsolete because it belongs to the 'sensible', 'psychical' level of perception which has to be transcended by the disciples. Historically, this passage was made possible by the revelation of the Logos.

It should be noted that, although Origen himself gives more credit to the Old Testament prophets and certainly to John the Baptist than Heracleon,[137] he still defines the nature of the transition marked by the death of John in similar terms. Thus, the passing from Israel to the church corresponds for him as well to a transition from the 'carnalia' to the 'spiritualia' and from the 'visibilia' to the 'invisibilia',[138] demanding a progress in perception from αἴσθησις to νόησις.[139]

In *EpJac*'s terms prophecy belongs to the realm of 'seeing' and 'hearing', not to that of *pistis* and *gnosis* as granted by Christ.[140] This explains logically why *EpJac*'s passage on prophecy (6:21-7:1) moves on, without any visible transition, to a complaint of Christ on the disciples' lack of understanding (*rnoei*) of his message, whether contained in parables or communicated to them 'openly' (7:1-6).[141] The obvious reason for Jesus' despair is that instead of 'grasping' (*rnoei*) the *gnosis* provided by the Logos (9:18-19), they cling to wonders and signs. Actually, if read from the perspective of the opposition inner vs. outer, the entire following passage, up to the first kingdom-parable (7:22), acquires a certain coherence: the disciples should hasten toward salvation out of their own inner urge, without needing any encouragement from outside (7: 10-16), and they should hate hypocrisy precisely because it is an outer pretension which runs counter to truth, as it stems from a false inner attitude, viz. 'evil thought' (7:17-22). In these lines, from 7:1 onwards, the author moves away by logical steps from the 'current issues' of martyrdom and prophecy, back to the initial theme of the Christian's inner preparation as a condition for salvation.

Conclusions

Salvation, according to *EpJac*, is essentially dependent on an inward process of spiritualisation. This progress of the believer towards God is denoted as 'being filled with the Spirit'. It finds its exemplary expression in the death of the martyr, who most radically turns away from the flesh and the world. Prophecy, on the other hand, is worthless for the believer's growth towards spiritual perfection. It belongs to a level of revelation which still demands visible, outward signs and is overcome by the revelation of the Logos. Saved will be those who come to rely on the interiorized gifts of belief and knowledge.

The above discussion allows a few more general remarks on *EpJac*. It appears that *EpJac* is a coherent unity showing a consistent teaching on the subject of the Christian's salvation. Its coherence is assured by the regular recurrence of certain themes and motifs which are subordinated to the central theme of the individual believer's inner preparation for salvation. This essential unity has to be accepted as long as the contrary cannot be proven, e.g. by parallel versions.

A host of literary and ideological parallels with classic Alexandrian gnosticism and with the Alexandrian catechetical tradition situates *EpJac* within the direct sphere of influence of Alexandria. The strength of these parallels and a number of historical considerations make it impossible to assign an early date to *EpJac*. The composition of Origen's *St. Matthew Commentary*, ca. 246,[142], may provide a safe *terminus post quem*. With regard to the question of its authorship or its dependence on a specific group or current within Alexandrian Christianity, a Valentinian origin has been several times proposed,[143] but as often rejected.[144] Here, perhaps, we have to admit our insufficient knowledge of a town where "les religions sont ... aussi variées que les négoces" (M. Yourcenar, *Mémoires d'Hadrien*).

* This study is an outcome of the research-project 'Earliest Christianity in Egypt and the New Testament' of the Faculty of Theology, New Testament Dept., Free University Amsterdam, directed by Dr. J. Helderman. I thank Dr. Helderman and Mr. H.E.M. Braakhuis for their advice and criticism, and Prof. Dr. B. van Elderen for correcting my English.

[1] J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: a study of the Eleventh Mandate*. Suppl. NT 37 (Leiden 1973) 157, n. 5.

[2] Students of *EpJac* will always be indebted to the *editio princeps*: M. Malinine et al., *Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha* (Zürich/Stuttgart 1968), hereafter: *ed.pr.*, for its wealth of in-

formation and ideas. The latest edition is by F.E. Williams, in H.W. Attridge (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex I.* NHS 22 & 23 (Leiden 1985). A review of research on *EpJac* by B. Dehandschutter is announced for *ANRW* II 25,5. D. Rouleau's new edition in the Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi appeared too late (Summer 1988) to be taken into account here.

[3] His name may have been contained in 1:2, where an ending *...thos* is preserved. It has been proposed, first by H.-M. Schenke, Der Jakobusbrief aus dem Codex Jung, *OLZ* 66 (1971) 118-19, to read here the name of the heresiarch Cerinthos. That this proposal rests on rather weak grounds appears already if one considers the number of names ending in *-thos* in F. Dornseiff & B. Hansen, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Berlin 1957) 221-23.

[4] The same combination of genres in the so-called *Epistula Apostolorum* (ed. C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu.* TU 43), and slightly different in the *Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC VIII,2). Cf. also F.E. Williams, in NHS 22, 17ff.

[5] On the period of 550 days after the resurrection I intend to publish a separate note; on the apostles writing their memoirs see R. Cameron, *Sayings traditions in the Apocryphon of James* (Philadelphia 1984) 19 ff.

[6] On this genre of dialogue: K. Rudolph, Der gnostische "Dialog" als literarisches Genus, in P. Nagel (ed.), *Probleme der koptischen Literatur* (Halle 1968) 85-107; E.H. Pagels, Visions, appearances and apostolic authority, in B. Aland et al. (eds.), *Gnosis: Festschrift H. Jonas* (Göttingen 1978) 415-30; Ph. Perkins, *The Gnostic dialogue* (New York etc. 1980), where, however, the discussion of *EpJac* (p. 145-56) is highly unsatisfactory as it tries to force *EpJac* into the Procrustean bed of anti-orthodox polemics.

[7] 2:22 ff. *EpJac*'s thematic coherence and inner consistency strongly argue against making it a field for text-critical exercises, cf. F.E. Williams, in NHS 22, 17-19, who rightly concludes after considering several counter-arguments: "tentatively... a literary unit"; "the work of one author".

[8] On this section: J. Zandee, Gnostische trekken in een apocryphe brief van Jacobus, *NTT* 17 (1962-63) 405 ff.; J. Helderman, Anapausis in the Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha, in R. McL. Wilson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis.* NHS 14 (Leiden 1978) 39 ff.; and the very rich commentary in *ed. pr.*, 41 ff.

[9] Cf. J. Zandee, Gnostic ideas on the fall and salvation, *Numen* 11 (1964) 13-74; K.N. Booth, 'Deficiency': a Gnostic technical term, in *Studia Patristica* 14. TU 117 (Berlin 1976) 191-202; but see too A. Wlosok, *Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis* (Heidelberg 1960) 77 ff., 83-84, 137 ff. & 146 ff.; J. Zandee, *"The Teachings of Silvanus" and Clement of Alexandria.* MVEOL 19 (Leiden 1977) 21-25, 52, 135.

[10] *rnêphe* (νήφειν) occurs again in 8:29, opposed to 'erring' (cf. J. Zandee, *op. cit.* (note 8), 408) and connected with *gnosis* as a condition for finding the Kingdom of Heavens.

[11] Again in 9:32 ff. where 'being awake' is a condition for being received in the Kingdom of Heavens. Cf. the discussion below and J. Zandee, *op. cit.* (note 8), 407-09.

[12] Cf. J. Zandee, *op. cit.* (note 8), 410-12; J. Helderman, *op. cit.* (note 8); the same, *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis.* NHS 18 (Leiden 1984) 283. The motif of 'reigning' (3:27) occurs again in a comparable context in 10:5-6, cf. J. Helderman, *op. cit.* (note 8), 41.

[13] *mouh*, 'to fill; to become full', is the keyword of this section, occuring at the outset, as the first condition for entering the Kingdom of Heavens (2:29-33), and as the actual aim of Christ's revelation to James and Peter (2: 33-35). It appears again in 3:8 and 3:35

ff., as well as in 12:30 (where it is said that the disciples should become full with the Kingdom), cf. J. Zandee, *op. cit.* (note 8), 405-407. The context of 3:8 (i.e. the damaged lines 6-7) seems to contain the opposition hearing vs. understanding (which thus is connected with 'becoming full'), another main theme of *EpJac* and of the rest of p.3 (lines 12-25), cf. the discussion below. Possible restorations of 3:6-7: F.E. Williams, in NHS 23, 10.

[14] Although *ed.pr.* finds the language of this passage "assez déroutant", it provides (p. 47) a good analysis. The dialectic of 'diminishing' (as for the lower nature) and 'becoming full' (with the Holy Spirit or God) occurs in Clement of Alexandria as well, cf. K. Schmöle, *Läuterung nach dem Tode und pneumatische Auferstehung bei Klemens von Alexandrien* (Münster 1974) 7-9 and 46-47.

[15] 4:22. D. Kirchner's translation, quoted by F.E. Williams, NHS 23, 13-14, is correct; the earlier one by Williams, in *The Nag Hammadi library in English* (Leiden 1977) 31 impossible. For a grammatival analysis cf. P. Jernstedt, Zur Determination im Koptischen, *Wissensch. Zeitschrift Martin-Luther-Universität* 27 (1978) 95-106. The *logos* (Williams: 'reason') referred to here is to be distinguished from the divine *Logos* elsewhere in *EpJac*, cf. *ed.pr.*, 47-48.

[16] I owe this insight, of capital interest for the interpretation of *EpJac*, to Dr. J. Helderman. Cf. J. den Boeft & J. Bremmer, Notiunculae martyrologicae II, *VC* 36 (1982) 385-87, and my forthcoming A note on *jôk ebol*, 'to die', *Enchoria* 16 (1988).

[17] Clem. Al., *Strom.* IV 4,14,3 (Stählin, 255); cf. G. W. H. Lampe, *PGL* 1384.a, sub C.

[18] On being filled with the Spirit as a technical term connected with prophecy: J. Reiling, *op. cit.* (note 1), 113 ff.; and his Marcus Gnosticus and the New Testament, in T. Baarda et al. (eds.), *Miscellanea Neotestamentica* I. Suppl. NT 47 (Leiden 1978) 161-79, esp. 169.

[19] As it appears here, the remarks of James are no less gauche and inappropriate than those ascribed to Peter, contra F. E. Williams, in NHS 22, 20. Unlike Williams, *op. cit.*, 20-21, I think not too much weight can be assigned to the place of James in *EpJac*: its explanatory value is restricted by the wide variety of sources which ascribe authority to James. For a different view: H.-Fr. Weiss, Die Bedeutung neuer Textfunde für die Frühgeschichte des Christentums in Ägypten, in P. Nagel (ed.), *Koptologische Studien* (Halle 1965) 220-235. *EpJac*, however, does not seem to provide any indication for a Jewish-Christian background, thus already *ed.pr.*, XXIII-XXIV.

[20] Thus, partly, already: D. Kirchner, Zum Menschenbild in der Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha, in P. Nagel (ed.), *Studien zum Menschenbild in Gnosis und Manichäismus* (Halle 1979) 141.

[21] On the anthropology of *EpJac*: J. Zandee, *op. cit.* (note 8), 415 ff.; *ed. pr.*, XVII ff. and 66-67; D. Kirchner, *op. cit.*, 139 ff. With *ed. pr.* I would like to stress the Pauline and Johannine inspiration of *EpJac*'s ideas.

[22] In 12:6 *tnho*, 'to make alive', has been corrected in *taho*, 'to raise'. Both give good sense.

[23] I take *aitia* in 12:11 to have a technical meaning: *occasio peccandi*, cf. e.g. Clem. Al., *Adumbr.* I (Stählin, 203, l. 12).

[24] Whether this implies that the body may partake of salvation, does not appear from *EpJac*. It does in other Nag Hammadi texts: *Epistula ad Rheginum* (NHC I,4), *Ev. Phil.* (NHC II,3); cf. J. Zandee, De opstanding in de brief aan Rheginos en in het evangelie van Philippus, *NTT* 16 (1961-62), 361-77, and K. Schmöle, *op. cit.* (note 14), 14-18. Esp. *Ep. Rheg.* 47:9-10 comes close to *EpJac*.

[25] Of the interpretations of 12:12-13 proposed in *ed.pr.*, 67-68, the last one is certainly right: *rphori ntsarks*: 'to wear the flesh' (i.e. like a garment; *ed. pr.* aptly quotes *Ev.Phil.* (NHC II,3) 56:29ff., which in turn quotes 1 Cor. 15:50; cf. also the dressing-undressing terminology in *EpJac* 14:35-36) should be parallelled to 'loving' and 'sparing the flesh' in the section on martyrdom (5:7-8 and 21). This blunt and absolute way of stating is characteristic of *EpJac*'s style.

[26] Gnostic: cf. H. Langerbeck, Die Anthropologie der alexandrinischen Gnosis, in *Aufsätze zur Gnosis* (Göttingen 1967) 38-82; or non-gnostic: M.F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle: the interpretation of St. Paul's epistles in the Early Church* (Cambridge 1967) 27 ff.

[27] Cf. Langerbeck, *op. cit.*, 73-80; and *infra*, note 42. See *ed. pr.*, XVII-XX, for a review of the relevant passages which, however, does not arrive at satisfactory conclusions.

[28] Thus F.E. Williams, in NHS 23, 24, who refers to the *Interpretation of Knowledge* (NHC XI, 1), but this text takes a view of prophecy opposite to that of *EpJac*!

[29] F.E. Williams' interpretation, *op. cit.*, 23, following G. Quispel's in *ed. pr.*, 60, which takes the 'archons' in 8:36 as hostile heavenly powers cannot be right. The passage 8:33 ff. is a renewed exhortation to gain salvation by accepting and following Christ (8:34), referring explicitly to his earthly teaching activity (8:37-38) as well as to his suffering (8:38-39), thus recapitulating motifs found already in the section on martyrdom, esp. 4:22-5:20 (key-words are: *ouah* = *nsô* = : 8:34, cf. 4:28, and *peithe nê* = : 9:9-10, cf. 4:24). Like in 1 Cor. 2:8 the archons are in a general sense the worldly powers responsible for Christ's exemplary death. The term *hupothesis* (which must mean here something like 'things to be said' or 'behavior') may have been chosen precisely to avoid any suggestion of prophetic speech as was generally ascribed to the martyrs, cf. *infra* note 125.

[30] In *Pistis Sophia šaje* can denote the disciples' 'pneumatic exegesis' (e.g. Schmidt, 58, l. 15 ff.); besides, this is made possible to them because the Spirit made them 'sober' (*nêphe*, e.g. *ibid.*, 52, l. 16 f) thus allowing them understanding, cf. G. Filoramo, Pneuma e conoscenza in alcuni testi gnostici, in J. Ries (ed.), *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique* (Louvain-la-Neuve 1982) 239-40. This complex is reminiscent of *EpJac*, but *šeje* is of course a rather unspecific term.

[31] I.e. 'from the beginning' (9:34), from the moment of their election; cf *supra* note 27.

[32] Cf. article νήπιος by G. Bertram, in *TWNT* 4, 913-25.

[33] It appears: 3:6-7 (probably; damaged passage); 3:12-25; 10:15-20; 12:35-13:1; 13:37-14:1 (cf. 7:1-6). John 20:29 is quoted (almost) literally in 12:41-13:1 (following the restoration of *ed. pr.*). This is actually the only quote among a wealth of Johannine allusions, listed by Ph. Perkins, Johannine traditions in *Ap. Jas.* (NHC I,2), *JBL* 101 (1982) 403-414. Cf. *ed. pr.*, 44-45 (on 3:18 ff.). I am not in sympathy with R. Cameron's treatment of *EpJac* 12:31-13:1, *op. cit.* (note 5), 44-54.

[34] In the passages listed in the preceding note, 'hearing', 'seeing' (etc.) are contrasted with 'knowing (Christ)' (*souôn* = , 2 times); 'understanding' (*rnoei*, 2 times; *raisthane*); 'believing' (*rpisteue*; *nahte*, restored).

[35] In 16:14-19; this explains the jealousy (16:4 & 6) of the apostles on account of the children (15:38) to be begotten (16:5), i.e. the future generations of the beloved with whom they may just hope to have a share (16:9-11; 20-23; 26-30).

[36] Coptic text 24:17-25:7 (Schmidt, 15*), already quoted in *ed. pr.*, 45. Cf. 4 Ezra 1:35-37 (Vulg.).

[37] *Comm. Joh.* X, 43 (Blanc, *SC* 157, 568).

[38] Cf. J. Helderman, *op. cit.* (note 8), 42.

[39] In 3:12-25 'hearing' (etc.) is connected with 'drunkenness' and 'sleep', and considered incompatible with '(possession of) life'; in 9:24 ff. 'hearing' is put on a par with 'sleeping', and considered incompatible with 'truth', 'knowledge' (*gnosis*) and the Spirit.

[40] Contrast: the Father does not stand in need, 9:11 ff. We may infer that the grace in 11:14 and 17 implies essentially 'belief' and 'knowledge'. Salvation supposes inner preparation, cf. K. Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker*. NHS 12 (Leiden 1978) 69.

[41] Cf. C. Scholten, *Martyrium und Sophiamythos im Gnostizismus nach den Texten von Nag Hammadi*. Erg. Bd. JAC 14 (Münster 1987) 35-47; see too K. Koschorke, *op. cit.*, 136-37.

[42] That martyrdom involves a choice is emphasized in 5: 3-6: if the disciples accept martyrdom, the Father will consider them to have "become (his) beloved according to his foresight (*pronoia*) by their free choice (*prohairesis*)". A striking parallel for this phrase, but omitting the divine foresight, is to be found in one of St. Athanasius' Coptic pastoral letters: in accepting martyrdom the Alexandrian martyrs have "become friends of God by their good *prohairesis*" (Lefort, *CSCO* 150, 128, 1. 32). A remarkable number of the concepts exhibited in this section of *EpJac* can be found in Clement of Alexandria, esp. *Strom.* IV 4,14,1-3 (Stählin, 254-55): besides the definition of martyrdom as perfection, τελείωσις, the martyrdom as parting with body (*soma*) and soul (*psyche*); the martyr becoming a beloved brother of the Lord on account of their common fate, and the combination of the martyr's προαίρεσις with the divine foresight of this.

[43] Cf. Scholten, *op. cit.* (note 41), 38-39, with whom I partly disagree.

[44] Origen, *Exhort. ad mart.* 39 (Koetschau, 36, l. 11 f.); cf. *EpJac* 3:35-37: "become full and leave no empty space (*topos...efšoueit*) within you".

[45] *Constit. Apostol.* V 1,2 (Metzger, *SC* 329, 202).

[46] Cf. K. Treu, Varia Christiana II, *APF* 32 (1986) 24, who refers to Homer, *Il.* 14, 55-56 and *Od.* 10, 3-4.

[47] E.g. Jer. 1: 18 and 15: 20; Zach. 2: 9 (5).

[48] More examples: C. Scholten, *op. cit.* (note 41), 38, n. 29. The wall-image was very popular in Egyptian monastic literature, e.g. Athanasius, *Vita Antonii* 9 (Migne, *PG* 26, 857 B; Coptic: Garitte, *CSCO* 117, 15, 1. 17-19: faith a wall against demons); idem, Coptic letter on charity and temperance (Lefort, *CSCO* 150, 119, 1. 13-14: humility a wall); in Pachomian literature (cf. A. de Vogüé, Les nouvelles lettres d'Horsièse et de Théodore, *Studia Monastica* 29 (1986) 30-31) and Shenoute (cf. A. Shisha-Halevy, Commentary on unpublished Shenoutiana in the British Library, *Enchoria* 6 (1976) 43, sub 51 ff.) used of monastic discipline.

[49] I. Balestri & H. Hyvernat (eds.), *Acta Martyrum II.* CSCO 86, 70, 1. 14 (Cod. Vatican. Copt. 85, f. 87).

[50] Cf. W. Rordorf, Aux origines du culte des martyrs, *Irénikon* 45 (1972) 317-18.

[51] Since the reality of suffering (both of Christ and of his followers) is repeatedly emphasized in *EpJac* (again in 8:38-39), it is difficult to take this passage to mean that "Gnostics are not exposed to any danger" (thus *ed. pr.*, 61-62) which 1° does not explain the stress on personal responsibility apparent on p. 9; 2° is out of tune with *EpJac* as a whole. Both 5:23 ff. and 9:18 ff. subordinate the outer realities of martyrdom to its importance as the reflection of an inner process. In this view, being persecuted and oppressed by oneself would be tantamount to being deficient; likewise, in 11:20 ff., the disciples are said to exclude *themselves* from salvation by the deficiency of their belief (cf. F.E. Williams, in NHS 23, 27-28).

[52] *EpJac* 5:31-6:18 is a dialectic discourse on life and death, for which see C. Scholten, *op. cit.* (note 41), 39-40; on *EpJac*'s concept of 'life', *ibid.* 42-44.

[53] Literally: 'the kingdom of death', but the emendation is probable, cf. F.E. Williams, in NHS 23, 17; there seem to be, moreover, traces of a correction in the manuscript (see *ed. pr.*, 54, bottom) which are, however, invisible in the facsimile.

[54] The translation 'those who kill themselves', preferred by F.E. Williams, is nonsensical. In *Epistula Apostolorum* IX, 1 (Schmidt, 6*) Christ calls the martyrs: *netauxatbou etbêt*: "those who have been killed on account of me". Cf. already L. Stern, *Koptische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1880) 303-04 (§ 478); in addition: H. Quecke, Zur Passivumschreibung im Koptischen, in J. Osing & G. Dreyer (eds.), *Form und Mass: Festschrift G. Fecht* (Wiesbaden 1987) 395-404. The reflexive ('to kill oneself') is clearly expressed in 12:8-9.

[55] Another urging to emulate Christ is found in 7:14-16: "be in advance of me, for thus the Father will love you". C. Scholten, *op. cit.* (note 41), 40-41, rightly rejects Kirchner's attempt (*op. cit.* [note 20], 141 ff.) to connect *EpJac* on account of this with the Carpocratian sect.

[56] This is the conclusion of the anthropological section (11: 35ff.) discussed above, which shares with the section on martyrdom the emphasis on renouncing the flesh and being saved by the Spirit. Thus 12: 15-17, too, may be concerned with the pneumatic's, resp. the martyr's, posthumous equality to Christ and his closeness within celestial hierarchy to God. For this theme, particularly popular in martyrological literature, see A.J. Wensinck, The oriental doctrine of the martyrs, in *Semietische studiën* (Leiden 1941) 90-113. Cf. too Clem. Al., *Strom.* IV 4,14,2 (Stählin, 254: the martyr 'beloved brother' of the Lord); *Constit. Apostol.* V 1,2 (Metzger, *SC* 329, 202: the martyr "brother of the Lord, son of the Most High—cf. Lc. 6:35—and receptacle of the Holy Spirit"); *Testamentum Domini* (Vööbus, *CSCO* 367, 9; *CSCO* 368, 33): the true believer who i.a. bears 'the mocking of the Cross' shall after death "dwell in the third order of my Father who has sent me". Cf. R. McL. Wilson's remark and the discussion in *ed. pr.*, 68.

[57] Hippolytus, *Refutatio* VI 35,2 ff. (Marcovich, 248-50); Clem. Al., *Exc. Theod.* 59-60 (Sagnard, *SC* 23, 176-78); cf. A. Orbe, *La teología del Espíritu Santo*. Anal. Gregoriana 158 (Rome 1966) 69-116.

[58] J. Zandee, *op. cit.* (note 8), 409-10. Cf. *Exc. Theod.* 61,4 (Sagnard, 180); other Valentinian parallels quoted in M. Malinine et al., *De resurrectione* (Zürich 1968) 23. On the development of the title 'Son of Man', cf. L. Bouyer, La notion christologique du Fils de l'homme a-t-elle disparu dans la patristique grecque?, in *Mélanges bibliques A. Robert* (Paris s.d.) 519-30.

[59] Unlike J. Zandee, *loc. cit.*, I do not see any docetism here. *EpJac* unequivocally emphasizes the reality of Christ's passion (5:9-20; 5:33-6:7; 8:37-9:1). The validity of the term 'docetism' with respect to Valentinian christology has been convincingly challenged by E.H. Pagels, Gnostic and orthodox views of Christ's passion, in B. Layton (ed.), *The rediscovery of Gnosticism*, vol. 1. Studies in the History of Religions 41 (Leiden 1980) 262-83.

[60] Quoted in reference to the nature of Christ by the Italian school of Valentinianism, *apud* Hipp., *Ref.* VI 35,6 (Marcovich, 249).

[61] Cf. *ed. pr.*, 76-77; P. Courcelle, Flügel der Seele I, in *RAC* 8, 29-65.

[62] A full discussion of this passage will be found in my forthcoming note 'La vision céleste dans l'Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha'.

[63] For this term, cf. *ed. pr.*, 84, and F.E. Williams, in NHS 23, 36, ad loc.

[64] Cf. the discussions in J. Zandee, *op. cit.*, (note 8), 418-19; *ed. pr.*, 82-83.

[65] Cf. in general: D.W. Bousset, Die Himmelsreise der Seele, *Archiv f. Religionswiss.* 4 (1901) 136-69 & 229-73; J. Daniélou, Les traditions secrètes des Apôtres, *Eranos Jahrbuch* 31 (1962) 199-215, esp. 206 ff.; C. Colpe, Die 'Himmelsreise der Seele' ausserhalb und innerhalb der Gnosis, in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le origini dello gnosticismo* (Leiden 1967) 429-45.

[66] This is Daniélou's criterion for distinguishing the 'Alexandrian' from the 'Asiatic' *Himmelsreise*-traditions, *op. cit.*, 207. His interpretation of the ascension-scene in *EpJac*, however, is mistaken.

[67] For the use of these lines in this context both by Clement and by heterodox gnosticism: S.R.C. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria* (Oxford 1971) 181.

[68] Thus too *ed. pr.* and J. Zandee, *loc. cit.* (note 64). For this tripartition, cf. A. Orbe, *Los primeros herejes ante la persecución*. Anal. Gregoriana 83 (Rome 1956) esp. 110-16.

[69] Origen, *Adhort. ad mart.* 13-14 (Koetschau, 13-14).

[70] This aspect of the scene is stressed by J. Zandee, *loc. cit.* (note 64), and *ed. pr.*, ad loc.

[71] Cf. esp. 8:10-27; 13:26-14:19. There is in *EpJac* no depreciation of *pistis* in favor of *gnosis*, on the contrary: that salvation depends on belief is stressed in 7 passages, cf. the following note.

[72] Receiving *gnosis* is a consequence of receiving the Logos (8:16-27; 9:18-19); the Logos, moreover, has as its first three elements: belief (*pistis*), love (*agape*) and the works (8:10-14)—through which life comes into existence (8: 14-15). Christ gives his disciples belief and knowledge, thus granting them life (13:37-14:10). He reveals himself to be known (13:38-14:2; 12:35-39) and grants his disciples in addition knowledge of themselves (12:20 ff.).

[73] *EpJac*'s pneumatology may be fruitfully compared to that of Clement, esp. as for the action of the Spirit, the role of *pistis* and *gnosis*, the ideal of perfection and its irreconciliability with ecstatic prophecy, cf. W.-D. Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch.* Beiträge z. Evangel. Theol. 63 (München 1972), esp. 59-60 & 65-76.

[74] Cf. *ed. pr.*, 55-56; F.E. Williams appears entirely at a loss here, in NHS 23, 18 bottom.

[75] A rich overview in J. Helderman, *Anapausis* (cit. note 12), 217-22; cf. too H. Schlier, Corpus Christi, in *RAC* 3, 437-53. The fable of Menenius Agrippa has an Egyptian prototype: G. Maspero, Fragment d'une version égyptienne de la fable des membres et de l'estomac, in *Etudes égyptiennes I* (Paris 1886) 260-64; cf. E. Brunner-Traut, *Altägyptische Tiergeschichte und Fabel* (Darmstadt 1968) 40-41 & 56. The theme of physical dis- and reintegration was of primary importance in Egyptian religious thought, cf. H. Beinlich, *Die "Osirisreliquien"*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 42 (Wiesbaden 1984); on its survival in Coptic literature: Th. Baumeister, *Martyr Invictus* (Münster 1972) 73-86.

[76] Thus Lactantius, e.g., employs it in dismissing, not prophecy, but pagan wisdom and saintliness, *Div. Instit.* VI, 9 (Brandt, 509 ff.).

[77] Cf. e.g. a New Kingdom Egyptian hymn (Leiden I, 344-vo, IX,9—unpublished) quoted by J. Zandee, Le roi-dieu et le dieu-roi dans l'Egypte ancienne, *Numen* 3 (1956) 231; Qûbân-stela, 1. 18 (K.A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions II*, 356, 1. 9 ff.). Later sources: B.H. Stricker, *De Ark des Verbonds*. Mededelingen Kon. Ned. Akad. van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde NR 34/3 (Amsterdam 1971) 5-7.

[78] Text: *The facsimile edition of the Nag Hammadi codices: Codices XI, XII and XIII*

(Leiden 1973); translation: in J. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi library in English* (Leiden 1977) 427-34; cf. K. Koschorke, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung, *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche* 76 (1979) 30-60.

[79] Esp. 16:27-31; 17:26-34; 18:28-38.

[80] B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* I (London 1898) 8-9; A. Harnack, Über zwei von Grenfell und Hunt entdeckte und publicirte altchristliche Fragmente, *Sitzungsber. kön.-preussischen Akad. der Wissensch. Berlin* 36 (1898) 517-20; J. Reiling, *op. cit.* (note 1) 125, n.2; J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Paris 1976) 244-45, nr. 682 (under Melito of Sardis); H. Paulsen, Papyrus Oxyrhynchus I.5 und die ΔΙΑΔΟΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ, *NTS* 25 (1978-79) 443-53.

[81] Thus Grenfell & Hunt, *op. cit.*, 8; Harnack, *op. cit.*, 519-20, dates the original text to the 2nd half of the 2nd century and ascribes it to Melito of Sardis.

[82] On the textual character of the Hermas-quote in P. Oxy. I,5 cf. Harnack, *op. cit.* (note 80), 517-18.

[83] Recto l. 9-15. The continuation, l. 15-16, and the fragments of the verso defy interpretation. H. Paulsen's emendation and his conclusions based upon it do not convince me.

[84] J. Reiling, *loc. cit.* (note 80), takes a point of view opposite to that of Harnack (and Paulsen, *op. cit.*, 445-46).

[85] For the interpretation of σωματεῖον (l. 10-11) I follow Paulsen, *op. cit.* (note 80), 444-45, who refers to Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 11:2.

[86] Cf. in general J.P. Martín, Il rapporto tra Pneuma ed Ecclesia nella letteratura dei primi secoli cristiani, *Augustinianum* 20 (1980) 471-83.

[87] J. Reiling, *op. cit.* (note 1), 122 ff., esp. 125; and his Prophecy, the Spirit and the Church, in J. Panagopoulos (ed.), *Prophetic vocation in the New Testament and today.* Suppl. NT 45 (Leiden 1977) 58-76.

[88] In his commentary on the gospel of St. John; cf. the discussion below.

[89] Clem. Al., *Exc. Theod.* 24,1 (Sagnard, 108-110); for the Valentinian view of the pneumatic church, see F.-M.-M. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne* (Paris 1947) 301-05; A. Orbe, *op. cit.* (note 57), 169-74.

[90] Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* 45,7 (Beeson, 66, 1.20-24), purporting to be a saying of Mani; quoted *ed. pr.*, 56. Although a striking parallel, combining like *EpJac* Mt. 11:13/Lc. 16:16 with John's decapitation, it lacks the typical element of the 'head of prophecy' (i.e. the interpretation of prophecy in physiological terms) and differs from *EpJac* in focus, cf. *infra* note 103.

[91] Girod, *SC* 162, 242-52.

[92] Cap. 21 (Girod, 242, 1. 4-6).

[93] *Ibid.*, 244, 1. 25-26; cap. 22, *ibid.*, 246, 1. 8-9; 252, 1. 60.

[94] *Ibid.*, 248, 1. 13-14.

[95] *Ibid.*, 250, 1. 31-34.

[96] *Ibid.*, 250, 1. 38-40.

[97] *Ibid.*, 252, 1. 56-64.

[98] *Comm. Matth.* X, 23 ff (Girod, 252 ff.); XI, 1 states once again explicitly, referring to Mt. 11:13/Lc. 16:16, that the end of prophecy coincides with the beheading of John (*ibid.*, 266, 1. 8-11). Clement, by contrast, does not seem to attach the same importance to the decapitation as Origen: John prophesied *till the baptism* of the Saviour, *Strom.* I 21, 136,2 (Stählin, 84, 1. 18-19).

[99] Hurst & Adriaen, *CCSL* 77, 120, 1. 1199-1203.

[100] Cf. G. af Hällström, *Charismatic succession: a study on Origen's concept of prophecy* (Helsinki 1985) 33. It was already a traditional theme, cf. e.g. Justin, *Dial.* 52,4.

[101] Cf. Af Hällström, *op. cit.*, 31-33.

[102] The antithesis 'body of prophecy'—'body of Christ', implied in *EpJac*, is quite explicit in Origen's opposition of the 'prophetic word' as a corpse, cut apart, to the unimpaired body of Christ, quoted above. On the body of Christ in Origen's ecclesiology, cf. e.g. *Comm. Joh.* X, 35 (Blanc, *SC* 157, 520 ff.) and H. de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit* (Paris 1950) 214-17 & 360-63. Apparently, Origen liked this kind of oppositions, cf. his interpretation of the 'body of sin' in Rom. 6:6 as a demonic counterpart, with the devil as its head, to the body of Christ (*Comm.Rom.* 5,9 [Migne, *PG* 14, 1046 A/B]; but cf. already Clem. Al., *Strom.* III 3,18,2 [Stählin, 204, 1. 6-7] on Rom. 7:24); on this concept: S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, vol. 1 (Rome 1946[2]) 160-166; A. Frank-Duquesne, Réflexions sur Satan en marge de la tradition judéo-chrétienne, in *Satan.* Études Carmélitaines 27/2 (Brugge 1948) 255-58.

[103] Cf. J. Ménard, *L'Évangile selon Thomas.* NHS 5 (Leiden 1975) 155; for *šaje hn-*, 'to speak *about*', cf. P. du Bourguet, Entretien de Chenouté, *BIFAO* 57 (1958) 107. In the same way, but closer to *EpJac* in its imagery, *Acta Archelai* 45,7 concentrates on the opposition 'priora' vs. 'posteriora', demarcated by the beheading of John (cf. *supra* note 90).

[104] This became a commonplace in patristic literature, cf. e.g. Clem. Al., *Protrept.* I 8,3-4; Pap. Bodmer X 53,6 ff.; Origen, *De princ.* II 6.4: *Hom. Cant. Cantic.* I,2 ad Cant. 1:2 (Rousseau, *SC* 37, 63); cf. G. af Hällström, *op. cit.* (note 100), 29-31. Neither *EpJac* nor *Ev.Thom.*, log. 52, betray any real depreciation of the Old Testament as expressed so forcefully in e.g. the *Second Logos of Seth* (NHC VII,2).

[105] Cf. Af Hällström, *op. cit.* (note 100) 31-34 & 48-49 ff.

[106] *Op. cit.*, 39 ff. In *Hom.Luc.* XXXII,2 (Crouzel, *SC* 87, 386-88) he opposes to the *prophets* of the Old Testament *organa*, 'instruments', through which Christ teaches in the church.

[107] *Contra Celsum* VI, 68; cf. Af Hällström, *op. cit.*, 32-33.

[108] *Contra Celsum* I, 2 & 46; II, 8; VII, 8.

[109] *Ibid.* VII, 11.

[110] *Comm. Matth.: Comm.Series* 40 (Klostermann, 80); cf. G. af Hällström, *op. cit.* (note 100), 32-33.

[111] Af Hällström, 48-49.

[112] *Ibid.*, 49 ff.

[113] *Adv. Haer.* III 11,9 (cf. also II 32, 4-5); see too Justin, *Dial.* 82,1.

[114] C.H. Roberts, *Manuscript, society and belief in early Christian Egypt* (London 1979) 63.

[115] *Ecl. Proph.* 23, 1-3 (Stählin, 143).

[116] Lines 73-80 (Lietzmann, *Kleine Texte* 1, 8-11).

[117] *Orac.Sibyll.* I, 386 (Geffcken, 24); on Christ as the terminus for prophetic revelation in the Pseudo-Clementines: H.J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen 1949) 108-09; cf. G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen.* TU 70 (Berlin 1981[2]) 148.

[118] H.L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, vol. 1, 127, sub b.; vol.2, 127-34; compare *Hom.Jer.* IV, 3 (Nautin, *SC* 232, 264, esp. 1. 12 ff.): decline of belief responsible for the

disappearance of signs and miracles. A comparable explanation for the disappearance of prophecy from the church in postapostolic times: *Ascensio Iesaiae* 3: 21-31, esp. 27-28.

[119] Cf. G. Friedrich, in *TWNT* 6, 861-63; J.L. Ash, The decline of ecstatic prophecy in the early church, *Theol. Studies* 37 (1976) 227-52.

[120] E.g. Marcus Gnosticus, cf. J. Reiling, *op. cit.* (note 18), esp. 170 ff. A recent review of research on Montanism: W.H.C. Frend, Montanism: research and problems, *Riv. Storia e Lett. Religiosa* 20 (1984) 521-37. Millenary expectations were at stake in a near-schism in mid-3rd century Egypt, cf. the fragments of Dionysius of Alexandria, *De promissionibus* (Feltoe, 102-126).

[121] Cf. Lucian's picture of the pseudo-prophets Alexander (cf. H.D. Betz, Gottmensch II, in *RAC* 12, 251-52) and Peregrinus (cf. H. Krämer, in *TWNT* 6, 793). Pagan practices provided polemical models for condemning forms of Christian prophecy: Eusebius' anti-Montanist source used Lucian's picture of Alexander in describing Montanus, cf. D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in early Christianity and the ancient Mediterranean world* (Grand Rapids 1983) 313; Origen used the example of pagan oracular practices against the popular Christian interest in τὰ μέλλοντα, cf. G. af Hällström, *op. cit.* (note 100), 26-27. Among Egyptian Christians there was a strong persistence of traditional oracular practices, cf. J. Černý, Egyptian oracles, in R.A. Parker, *A Saite oracle papyrus from Thebes* (Providence 1962) 47-48; more examples: K. Treu, *op. cit.* (note 46), 29-30. In Asia the oracles of Clarus and Didyma flourished particularly in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D., cf. H.W. Parke, *The oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor* (London 1985) 69 ff. & 142 ff.

[122] On the effect of Montanism on the valuation of Christian prophecy: P. de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste* (Paris 1913) 562 ff.

[123] On Origen, cf. G. af Hällström, *op. cit.* (note 100), 49 ff.; Clement intended to deal with the 'Phrygians' in a work 'On prophecy' (cf. e.g. *Strom.* IV 93,1), which either was never written or got lost.

[124] E.g. Tertullian, *De anima* 9,3; *De ieiunio* 11,6; *Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox*, cf. P. de Labriolle, *Sources sur l'histoire du Montanisme* (Fribourg/Paris 1913) 96; *La crise montaniste*, 565-66.

[125] Thus e.g. Origen, *Adhort. ad mart.* 39 (see *supra* note 44). Cf. M. Viller, Les martyrs et l'esprit, *RSR* 14 (1924) 544-551; M. Lods, *Confesseurs et martyrs: successeurs des prophètes* (Neuchâtel/Paris 1958); W.C. Weinreich, *Spirit and martyrdom* (Washington D.C. 1981).

[126] *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des IIe et IIIe siècles* (Paris 1961) esp. 39-43. On martyrdom and prophecy in anti-montanist polemics, see too W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei* (Tübingen 1964²) 134-49 (ch. VII).

[127] Cf. e.g. the section on the martyr in *Constit.Apostol.* V; see B. Kötting, Die Stellung des Konfessors in der alten Kirche, *JAC* 19 (1976) 7-23, and the works by Viller and Lods cited *supra* note 125.

[128] *Comm.Matth.* X, 22 (Girod, *SC* 162, 250).

[129] Cf. e.g. *Hom.Luc.* IV (Greek fragm.; Rauer, 26-27); *Comm. Cant. Cantic.* I (Baehrens, 91).

[130] See Y. Janssens, Héracléon: Commentaire sur l'Évangile selon Saint Jean, *Muséon* 72 (1959) 101-51 (text and translation) & 277-99; E.H. Pagels, *The Johannine gospel in gnostic exegesis* (Nashville/New York 1973).

[131] A term found already in Pap. Oxy. I,5, where it denotes the church in its entirety.

[132] Jean-Baptiste dans les fragments d'Héracléon, *Ephem.Theol. Lovan.* 30 (1954) 301-

22; E.H. Pagels, *op. cit.* (note 130), 51ff., arrives at about the same conclusions but does not mention Mouson. Cf. too C. Blanc, in *SC* 157, 27-38, and D. Devoti, L'antropologia di Eracleone attraverso la figura di Battista, *Atti Accademia delle Scienze Torino* 107 (1972-73) 709-56. On John's role in later sources: L.E. Keck, John the Baptist in Christianized Gnosticism, in C.J. Bleeker (ed.), *Initiation*. Studies in the History of Religions 10 (Leiden 1965) 184-94; W.C. Till, Johannes der Täufer in der koptischen Literatur, *MDAIK* 16 (1958) 310-32.

[133] Fragm. in Y. Janssens, *op. cit.* (note 130), 106-07; discussed by Origen, *Comm.Joh.* VI, 108-111 (Blanc, *SC* 157, 210-12).

[134] Cf. J. Mouson, *op. cit.* (note 132), 310-13; E.H. Pagels, *op. cit.* (note 130), 52-57.

[135] Heracleon's interpretation of John 4:46-54 (Janssens, 119-21) fulfills a key-role in his exegesis, cf. J. Mouson, *op. cit.*, 310-11; E.H. Pagels, *op. cit.*, 83-85. Also *Interpretation of Knowledge* (NHC XI,1) 1:14-15 makes use of John 4:48 to distinguish two kinds of belief, cf. K. Koschorke, *op. cit.* (note 78), 36, but once more to an effect opposite of that of *EpJac*.

[136] As K. Koschorke, *op. cit.* (note 78), 36, n. 28, aptly remarks, prophecy is rejected by *EpJac* "als Form äusserer Heilsvermittlung". Unfortunately he does not provide any further comment.

[137] At least, Origen feels obliged to defend the Old Testament prophets against Heracleon, *Comm.Joh.* VI, 109-10; cf. G. af Hällström, *op. cit.* (note 100) 10ff. On his view of John the Baptist see J. Daniélou, *Origène* (Paris 1948) 243-47.

[138] *Comm. Cant. Cantic.* III (Baehrens, 220) and Greek fragment, *apud* Procopius (Baehrens, 226 = Migne, *PG* 87^2, 1605 C): the 'somatic' elements of the law and the prophets, which have been overgrowing the 'pneumatic' elements, cut away at the appearance of Christ. Also for Origen the demand for 'signs' denotes 'the carnal men and the lovers of the sensible': οἱ σωματικοὶ καὶ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς φίλοι, *Comm.Joh.* X, 35 (Blanc, *SC* 157, 518).

[139] Cf. J. Daniélou, *Origène*, 145 ff. A comparable view in Ptolemy, *Ep. ad Floram* 5,2 (Quispel, *SC* 24, 56).

[140] Thus, we may perhaps class the prophetic *logos* of 6:27 with the lower, 'psychical' *logos* of 4:20-22.

[141] The enigmatic lines 6-10 may mean something like: 'while you still do not understand me, I have no illusions whatever about you'—thus perhaps preluding to the theme of hypocrisy in lines 17 ff.

[142] For this date, cf. Eusebius, HE VI 36,1-2, and R. Girod, *SC* 162, 7-8.

[143] Thus already H.-Ch. Puech and G. Quispel, Les écrits gnostiques du codex Jung, *VC* 8 (1954) 7-22.

[144] First by W.C. van Unnik, The Origin of the recently discovered "Apokryphon Jacobi", *VC* 10 (1956) 149-56. This discussion produced a growing awareness that no clear-cut categories apply to *EpJac*, cf. the brief remarks by F.E. Williams, in NHS 22, 20-22.

2317 CV *Leiden*, Arendshorst 102